

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/622,176	07/10/2003	Swee Mok	CM013661D01	2152
22917	7590 . 10/02/2006		EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA, INC.			EVANISKO, GEORGE ROBERT	
1303 EAST A	ALGONQUIN ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SCHAUMBURG, IL 60196			3762	
			DATE MAIL ED: 10/02/200	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			(p			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/622,176	MOK ET AL.			
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit			
		George R. Evanisko	3762			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app					
	for Reply					
WHI - Ext after - If N - Fai An	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' ICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA tensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 er SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. IO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period vidure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute by reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing fried patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the course the application to become ABANDO	ON. timely filed om the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)[∑	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ju	ulv 2003				
	_	s action is non-final.				
	Since this application is in condition for allowar		prosecution as to the merits is			
,	closed in accordance with the practice under E					
Disposi	tion of Claims					
·	Claim(s) <u>10-23</u> is/are pending in the application	n.				
-/-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)[	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)区	Claim(s) 10-23 are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applica	tion Papers					
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc		e Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	tion is required if the drawing(s) is o	objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)	] The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	ce Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign    All   b  Some * c  None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents		a)-(d) or (f).			
	<ul><li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents</li><li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li></ul>		ation No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior					
	application from the International Bureau	•	ved in this realisman energy			
*	See the attached detailed Office action for a list		ved.			
Attachme	int(s)					
_	ice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summa	iry (PTO-413)			
2) 🔲 Not	ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail	Date			
	ermation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) ter No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	Patent Application			
, 46	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	٠, <u></u> .				

Art Unit: 3762

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 10 and 11, drawn to a ground wire, classified in class 600, subclass 372.
- II. Claims 12-15, drawn to a movable electrode, classified in class 600, subclass 393.
- III. Claims 16-23, drawn to an EMG device, classified in class 600, subclass 546.

  The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions III and (I and II) are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require repositionable electrodes or a flexible strip carrying a conductor for the reference voltage. The subcombination has separate utility such as an ECG ground or ECG electrodes, not requiring the sensing or monitoring of EMG signals.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable

Application/Control Number: 10/622,176

Art Unit: 3762

in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Inventions II are I related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination I has separate utility such as a ground for an ECG apparatus using two fixed electrodes, not requiring the electrodes to be repositionable. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Daniel Nichols on 9/25/06 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George R. Evanisko whose telephone number is 571 272 4945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-5:00.

Application/Control Number: 10/622,176

Art Unit: 3762

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571 272 4955. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

George R Evanisko Primary Examiner Art Unit 3762

9/25/6

GRE

September 25, 2006